

## **REMARKS**

### **1. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-20 were pending in the Application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 2, and 8 and canceled claim 20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have added new claim 21. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-19 and 21 will remain pending in the application.

### **2. Rejections under 35 USC § 112**

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as the conditional elements are clear to one of skill in the art. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 8 and canceled claim 20 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

### **3. Rejections under 35 USC § 103**

In section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,292 to Reisinger, et al. ("Reisinger '292") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,629,871 to Scribner, et al. ("Scribner '871").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the Reisinger '292 reference and disagree with the stated rationale supporting the purported combination of the references.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to recite several additional limitations supported at least at paragraph 0038 of the specification. Accordingly, the rejection is moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. Claims 2-7 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons discussed with reference to the independent and any intervening claims.

Applicants do not discern any intended statements of Official Notice and thus dispute any so intended statements.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1-7.

In section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 8-10, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,292 to Reisinger, et al. ("Reisinger '292") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,629,871 to Scribner, et al. ("Scribner '871") and further in view of WO 00/52614 by Brookner et al. (Brookner '614").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the Reisinger '292 reference and disagree with the stated rationale supporting the purported combination of the references.

However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 8 to recite several additional limitations supported at least at paragraph 0038 of the specification and canceled claim 20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, the rejection is moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference. Claims 9-10 and 17 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons discussed with reference to the independent and any intervening claims.

Applicants do not discern any intended statements of Official Notice and thus dispute any so intended statements.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 8-10 and 17.

In section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,292 to Reisinger, et al. ("Reisinger '292") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,629,871 to Scribner, et al. ("Scribner '871"), in further in view of WO 00/52614 by Brookner et al. (Brookner '614") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,626 B1 to Thiel ("Thiel '626").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 8 and the rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 11 is patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons discussed with reference to the independent and any intervening claims.

Applicants do not discern any intended statements of Official Notice and thus dispute any so intended statements.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 11.

In section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,292 to Reisinger, et al. ("Reisinger '292") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,629,871 to Scribner, et al. ("Scribner '871"), in further in view of WO 00/52614 by Brookner et al. (Brookner '614"), in further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,626 B1 to Thiel ("Thiel '626") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,650,433 B1 to Keane, et al. ("Keane '433").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 8 and the rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 12-13 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons discussed with reference to the independent and any intervening claims.

Applicants do not discern any intended statements of Official Notice and thus dispute any so intended statements.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 12-13.

In section 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,292 to Reisinger, et al. ("Reisinger '292") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,629,871 to Scribner, et al. ("Scribner '871"), in further in view of WO 00/52614 by Brookner et al. (Brookner '614") and further in view of U.S. Patent Applicant Publication No. 2003/0097337 A1 by Brookner, et al. ("Brookner '337").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 8 and the rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claim 14 is patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons discussed with reference to the independent and any intervening claims.

Applicants do not discern any intended statements of Official Notice and thus dispute any so intended statements.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 14.

In section 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,292 to Reisinger, et al. ("Reisinger '292") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,629,871 to Scribner, et al. ("Scribner '871"), in further in view of WO 00/52614 by Brookner et al. (Brookner '614"), in further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,383,115 to Lecarpentier ("Lecarpentier '115") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,208,980 B1 to Kara ("Kara '980").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 8 and the rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 15-16 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons discussed with reference to the independent and any intervening claims.

Applicants do not discern any intended statements of Official Notice and thus dispute any so intended statements.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 15-16.

In section 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,148,292 to Reisinger, et al. ("Reisinger '292") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,629,871 to Scribner, et al. ("Scribner '871"), in further in view of WO 00/52614 by Brookner et al. (Brookner '614"), in further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,715,164 to Liechti, et al. ("Liechti '164").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 8 and the rejection is moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 18-19 are patentable over the cited reference for at least the same reasons discussed with reference to the independent and any intervening claims.

Applicants do not discern any intended statements of Official Notice and thus dispute any so intended statements.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 18-19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention as presently claimed in claims 1-19 and 21 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

#### **4. Conclusion Of Remarks**

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

**5. Authorization**

No fee is believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-388-O1.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-388-O1.

Respectfully submitted,

/George M. Macdonald/

---

George M. Macdonald  
Reg. No. 39,284  
Attorney for Applicant  
Telephone (203) 924-3180  
PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department  
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000